



Santiago de Chile, Mayo 11, 2005

United States Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window, Mail Stop RCE
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
United States

Atte: Ronald Laneau

Ref: Response to final action mailed 03/25/2005, Request for continue Examination

Dear Mr. Laneau:

Please find attached my response to the final office action mailed in 03/25/2005 in relation to application 1/064,533 filed in 07/24/2002.

The attached documents include appropriate correction to the claims according the objections and rejections informed by the examiner and arguments to overcome the new ground for obviousness rejection under 35 USC 103.

I have done this submission in bona fide and respectfully request to the office the withdraw of the obviousness rejections and the review of the amended claim in order to continue with the patent process for the invented business model.

If any doubt, please contact me by:

Email: lguglielmucci@hotmail.com

Phone: +56 2 3725413 Office
+56 2 2835923 Home
+56 9 8218893 Mobile

Mail: Luis Felipe Guglielmucci
Enrique Barrenechea 3820, Macul
Santiago, Chile.

Yours very truly,

Luis Felipe Guglielmucci

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION MAILED 03/25/2005

Application number: 10/064,533

Filing Date: 07/24/2002

Named Inventor: Luis Felipe Guglielmucci

Confirmation number: 8347

Examiner: LANEAU, RONALD

Content

1	Abstract:.....	3
2	Claim Objections because informalities	3
3	Claim rejections – 35 USC 112.....	4
4	Claim rejection – 35 USC 103.....	4
4.1	Examiner Arguments:	4
4.2	SITNIK US 6,300,880	4
4.3	NAKAMURA US 6,687,378	4
5	Arguments	5
5.1	Arguments on Nakamura.....	5
5.1.1	Business Model versus Technology	5
5.1.2	Common aspects in between Nakamura and 10/064,533 that could lead to misinterpretation.....	6
5.2	Arguments on Sitnik and Nakamura or Sitnik alone	7
6	Conclusions	8
7	Claim 3 amended.....	11
8	Amendments to claim 3, detail.....	11